

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,429	08/19/2003	Olaf Vancura	1482/198()	4544
23381 7	7590 10/20/2004		EXAMINER	
DORR CARS	SON SLOAN & BIRN	PIERCE, WILLIAM M		
3010 EAST 6T DENVER, CO		ADTIBUT DARCO MUMOCO		PAPER NUMBER
,			3711	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			ω	
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/643,429	VANCURA, OLAF		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	William M Pierce	3711		
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replection of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communications. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.	
Status				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 J	lanuary 2004.			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ▼ Thi	s action is non-final.			
3) Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	· (s is	
Disposition of Claims				
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application	١.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er			
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>15 January 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊠ objected to by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		·		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	•	` '	1/d\	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, -	• • •		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. 8	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) All b) Some * c) None of:	,	, , , , , ,		
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document	ts have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority document		onlication No		
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		···		
application from the International Burea	•	rosonos in uno rialional olago		
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list		received.		
			 .	
		WII, LIAM M. PIERC	E	
Attachment(s)		PROGRAM EXAMINE		
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)		
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	F	s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12</u>. 	6) Other:			

Application/Control Number: 10/643,429

Art Unit: 3711

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

Claim 1 and it dependant claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In claim 1, In. 20, "the at least one response" and in claim 3, "said presenting" and "the operation of a randomly set timer" lack a proper antecedent.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 generally relates to a manipulation of "people" (or players). In line with MPEP 2105,

"If the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claimed invention as a whole encompasses a human being, then a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 must be made indicating that the claimed invention is directed to nonstatutory subject matter."

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Demar et al in view of Walker and Feud History (i.e. Family Feud.)

Demar is representative of types of slot machines that have a primary wagering game played in combination with a secondary bonusing game. The bonusing game is entered upon a predetermined occurrence in the primary game which may be a single event, combination of events or an accumulation of desired events. Like Demar, the instant invention calls for a primary wagering game with a secondary game. However, Demar fails to discuss a "survey based bonus game" as called for in the claim. Walker teaches that trivia type bonusing games are known.

One well known trivia game is the Family Feud. To have replaced the "bonus mode" of Demar with a Family Feud

Application/Control Number: 10/643,429 Page 3

Art Unit: 3711

type trivia game would have been an obvious matter of replacing one known game for that of another. In the instant case, merely changing the types of games combined must show some particular problem solved or some unexpected results achieved to be considered critical to the claimed invention.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Thomas, Gura, Pierce, Adams and Giobbi show primary/secondary combination type bounusing games. Claypole, Thompson and keller show trivia games combined with a wagering game.

Any inquiry concerning this communication and its merits should be directed to William Pierce at E-mail address bill.pierce@USPTO.gov or at telephone number (703) 308-3551.

Any inquiry not concerning the merits of the case such as missing papers, copies, status or information should be directed to Tech Center 3700 Customer Service Center at (703) 306-5648 where the fax number is (703) 308-7957 and the email is Customerservice3700@uspto.gov.

For **official fax** communications to be officially entered in the application the fax number is (703) 872-9306. For **informal fax** communications the fax number is (703) 308-7769.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the **status** of this application or proceeding can also be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

Any inquiry concerning the **drawings** should be directed to the Drafting Division whose telephone number is (703) 305-8335.

WILLIAM M. PIERCE PRIMARY EXAMINER